



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,348	08/28/2003	Daniel Ray Downing	DN2001124D01	6674

27280 7590 10/19/2006

THE GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 823
1144 EAST MARKET STREET
AKRON, OH 44316-0001

EXAMINER

GOODMAN, CHARLES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/650,348

Applicant(s)

DOWNING, DANIEL RAY

Examiner

Charles Goodman

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 29 and 33-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 20 and 22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23, 26, 27, 29 and 33-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment filed on 7/24/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 23, 26, 27, 29 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benzing (WO 00/51810) in view of Oldeman (US 4,922,774).

Benzing discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that it appears that Benzing lacks the second support surface being not tangent to the first support surface. However, Oldeman teaches an anvil (9) having first and second support surfaces that are not tangent to each other. Moreover, such a configuration appears to work equally well in facilitating the cut of the material. Note Figs. 1-2. Thus, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of the instant invention to modify the invention of Benzing to thereby have a non-tangent second surface for the reasons stated supra.

Regarding the inclination ranges of theta two, they are deemed to be obvious matter of design choice.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-5, 20 and 22 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/24/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's basic argument that the combination of Benzing and Oldeman do not render obvious the claimed invention, this argument is traversed.

First, Applicant's contention that neither reference teach the claimed gap distance d is traversed to the extent that the primary reference Benzing clearly teaches such a distance. Benzing states in the first couple of lines in p. 10 that the depth (d) is less than or equal to the thickness of the strip. Applicant's contention without some sort of support fails to persuade.

Second, Applicant's contention that the combination would not be obvious mainly because the references are concerned with cutting reinforced versus non-reinforced rubber fails when both are analogous art. Both references require cutting of rubber to manufacture tires, and therefore the characteristics and the method of cutting the skives are pertinent to both whether the strip is reinforced or not. Since the "tangential" and "non-tangential" anvil configurations in both references appear to work equally well in facilitating the skive cut, either anvil configurations are obvious modifications to each other.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Goodman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between 8:30 AM to


Art Unit: 3724

6:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley, can be reached on (571) 272-4502. In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to **(571) 273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

cg 
October 16, 2006


Charles Goodman
Primary Examiner
AU 3724

CHARLES GOODMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER